New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernon Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	1.33	One month	.50
One year	6.00	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.39	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Lord Robert Cecil's Real Service.

It would not be too much to say that no Englishman has contributed more to improving the situation, so far as Anglo-American relations are concerned, than Lord Robert Cecil. He has done this, too, not through the machinery of international official relations, but rather through that unofficial medium of intercourse, the newspaper, which, so far as the United States is concerned at least, has to an unprecedented degree supplanted the ambassador and the diplomat.

After the Dernburg fiasco the Germans learned their lesson. They no longer undertook to supply the American public on American soil with German facts and German fictions, prepared in such fashion as only a German could prepare them and only a German could understand or accept them. Instead, they fell back upon the ordinary machinery of American newspapers; they not alone took advantage of methods of American newspapers, but y used the American correspondents of American newspapers in Berlin. They did not use them in any wrongful way; there has been a great deal of unjust criticism of those correspondents and the newspapers that they have served, both in this country and in England.

The business of the American correspondent is to transmit the news that he acquires. If the German Chancellor, the German Crown Prince, if other Germans of only less prominence are willing to talk in the first person, to assert, to describe, to declare, the business of the correspondent is to transmit these declarations, and anything that these men may say is, in our journalese, "good copy."

All this was totally foreign to the British method of doing business. British aversion to this method was enhanced by the British belief that all or almost all of what these Germans said must be false, deliberately false and designed to deceive. To the first suggestions that they follow the German course and conform to the conditions and methods of the American newspaper the British public men responded with an emphatic negative. If the Germans chose, as they phrased it, to "lie to the American public," if the American public cared to listen to such statements, then that was something beyond the remedy of British public men.

The fallacy of this was patent. The fact that Germans chose to use American newspapers and correspondents to disseminate what the British regarded as untruths was not in the least a reason why the British should not take advantage of the same machinery to assert the truth as they saw it. But there was for a long time a very natural prejudice against doing anything that seemed to follow the German example.

And the German method did have its successes. The mass of the American public were more or less impressed by the fact that the German Chancellor was not too busy to explain his case to the humblest American newspaper reader, he was not too proud to talk and to talk as the American is accustomed to see his own public men talk whenever there is occasion for speaking. As against the utterances of the Crown Prince or Bethmann-Hollweg, the anonymous outgivings of the British Press Bureau attracted little attention and in our newspaper scheme of things were relegated to inconspicuous corners of our journals, while the Germans claimed the front page and the headlines.

All this resulted in grave disadvantages to the British, who had practical as well as sentimental reasons for wanting to have their side of questions understood in America. It resulted in the rather preposterous situation in which German officials in Berlin and the German Ambassador in Washington were able to get before the American public in a most conspicuous and appealing fashion their explanations not alone of matters affecting Germany and the United States, but affecting the United States and Great Britain.

It is to the everlasting credit of Lord Robert Cecil that he was the first British Cabinet minister to appreciate the situation as it existed, to lay aside British tradition and prejudice and to talk frankly, freely and in the form of "interview" we understand in this country to the American correspondents in London. And certainly no one can mistake the effect now. No one will pretend that Americans have accepted the point of view Lord Robert has set forth in many instances. No one will pretend that he has always carried his audience, but the fact is that he has been able over and over again to get the British point of view before the great newspaper reading public of this country.

It is not too much to say that, in a sense, Lord Robert has come to be the spokesman for his country, so far as the American press is concerned. And as its spokesman he has not, as Britons all feared when the question of interviews was first considered, indulged in foolish or trouble-making words. His public statements have not irritated the American government nor disturbed the American public. This is not alone due to the fact that he has spoken wisely; it is due also to the fact that he has merely fallen in with the custom that prevails in America. It was just what Americans expected; the reasons that it did not prevail in Britain were incomprehensible to them, and, failing to understand, they attributed British silence to British arrogance; they reasoned that the British did not care what Americans thought because they did not explain their case by our method. Of course, this was all profit to the Germans, who made the most out of the affair.

In recent months other British public men have followed Lord Robert; there has been a marked change in method and policy. The most notable of all the public statements Sir Edward Grey has made was made to a Chicago newspaper, and it had an incredibly wide circulation in this country. But it has been Lord Robert Cecil who, day in and day out, quite as any one of our own men in official position would do, has explained the British situation, until he has become accepted in our newspaper world as the spokesman of the British government, and if one only measured the thing by the space and prominence that his statements have earned in our newspapers, the benefit to the British would be patent.

The American newspaper and the American newspaper correspondent are institutions quite peculiar to ourselves. But they are institutions, and not in the least a mere side issue. We expect our public men to explain their purposes and policies to us, not in public speeches, not on official occasions, but day by day and in our newspapers. The President of the United States fixes hours each week in which he receives the Washington correspondents and answers their questions. He is not quoted, but every newspaper reader in the country knows the source of those statements that follow these conferences. But every other public official speaks in his own person and without the cover of anonymity.

This is our way of doing things. It is the way we are used to getting our information. The Germans, after a grave blunder, appreciated it and conformed to it. The British were less quick to learn. Particularly they failed to grasp the value to them of American correspondents in London, who were, in fact, the best and most effective instruments in their hands to place their views before the American public, but could only succeed in doing this if they were permitted to follow the American method.

In recent months there has been a very great change. If Lord Robert has been the most conspicuous contributor to the change there have been others who have followed his example. No friend of the Allied cause in America will regret the change, will, in fact, fail to derive satisfaction from the new spirit that is revealed in London. It was not easy for a nation or an officialdom as conservative as the British to change its methods to meet American customs, even when British interests were to be served thereby. That this has been done is a tribute to the fashion in which war has taught and is teaching the English. And since the outbreak of the war no Englishman has made a greater or more useful contribution to maintaining friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain than has Lord Robert Cecil.

Covering Up the Facts.

It is a grave charge which the National Civil Service Reform League brings against President Wilson and the Federal Civil Service Commission—nothing less than the suppression of facts which the public has a right to know, lest publicity regarding them "might lead to such criticism of the Administration as would seriously embarrass it." The Wilson Administration is accused of having bestowed jobs on politicians by a shrewd use of technicalities, and the President and his commission stand convicted of covering up the facts in the case.

Under Presidents Roosevelt and Taft, the fourth-class postmasters then holding jobs were taken into the competitive class of the civil service without examination. Probably most, if not all, of them were Republicans. Two months after he took office President Wilson by executive order threw open most of the fourth-class postmasterships to competitive examination. For this, of course, the incumbents and all other persons were eligible, and under the regulations of the Civil Service Commission the Postmaster General might make appointments, not of the highest candidates in the examinations, but from among the three standing at the top of the list.

The proceeding aroused suspicion, and soon came complaints that Democrats were being appointed instead of Republicans who had received higher ratings in the examinations. Complaints were also received by the league that Postmaster General Burleson, in motorization of the rural free delivery service, was substituting "deserving" Democrats for old carriers of the opposite political faith whenever a technicality enabled him to do so.

In September, 1913, the league made a formal request for permission to examine the commission's records regarding the examinations for fourth-class postmasterships. It desired to ascertain the number of candidates who participated in the examinations, their names, ratings received and the names of the appointees. Permission was refused. Again in 1914 it was refused on the ground that to grant it would interfere with the commission's work. It was persistently refused until in March of this year President McIlhenny, of the commission, told President Dana, of the league, that if access were granted to the records sought it might lead to embarrassing criticism of the Administration.

So far President Wilson himself has sustained the action of his commission, although it has been pointed out to him that such records are open to the public in states and cities all over the country, and that only once before—in 1899—has access to any records of the National Commission been denied. The inference is obvious. There would only be such secrecy if publicity could be damaging in the present campaign. The President and his Commissioners are good enough politicians to know that their refusal to make known the facts must be damaging to the Democratic candidate's chances. The inevitable query, therefore, is how much more damaging the facts regarding the bestowal of jobs on patronage-grabbers would be.

The affair leaves a bad taste in the mouth—the worse because Mr. Wilson once had some standing as a civil service reformer. Apparently in that respect, as in so many others, his earlier theories did not affect his later deeds.

No Politics with Public Money.

When Mr. Hughes says that if elected President he'll see that the country has efficient, businesslike government, with no "pork" barrels, regardless of its effect on his personal political fortunes, the voters may know that it is no idle campaign promise. His entire course as Governor of New York State proved him capable and willing to do what he deemed for the public interest, no matter what the effect on his own interests was.

The Democrats went into office pledged to retrenchment and economy. Their Administration has produced a "war tax," the proceeds of which have been devoted to paying for extravagances, and a "pork bill" of scandalous size. Their economy has been a myth. Their retrenchment has consisted in grabbing appropriations for "local improvements" which will improve nothing so much as the Democratic political machines in those localities.

Rich as this country is, it is too poor to fatten politicians on "pork" indefinitely. Mr. Hughes doesn't play politics with the public's money. He never paid political debts by appointing inefficient politicians to offices of trust. His record stands in striking contrast to that of Democracy's.

"Common Decency" Prevails.

In accepting the Federal Board's offer of mediation the "Big Four" officials have done a wise and public-spirited thing. This does not, of course, mean that possibility of a general railway strike is permanently averted. But it does offer every opportunity for a calm and sane discussion of hours and wages with the railway operators which should lead to settlement of the dispute without the disastrous effects of a tie-up of the country's transportation systems.

Manifestly both the railway operators and the "Big Four" representatives understand well the responsibility resting on them in this grave situation. Neither party can afford to take an arbitrary stand, pressing its own interests with a "public be damned" disregard of consequences. And if that attitude be avoided, there is little likelihood that reason and mutual concessions will not bring about a settlement as fair and just to all concerned as the settlement of any capital and labor dispute ever is. The first step has been taken with due regard for the public, so vitally concerned. It is to be hoped all others will show the same regard for "common decency," as one of the union representatives phrased it.

Still Bleeding Belgium.

(From The Providence Journal.)

The forcible removal out of their country of nearly ten thousand Belgians by the German authorities, presumably to be placed on German farms to aid in harvesting the crops, is only another instance of how the Kaiser is deliberately bleeding the conquered country.

The whole country, indeed, is physically, if not technically, in bondage to the Hun. Its labor and capital are subject to any requisition the hated foreign authority that sits at Brussels chooses to make. Belgians may not be compelled actually to take up arms against their own countrymen and the soldiers of the Allies, on the trench border, but they are forced to do military work behind the lines.

The draft of ten thousand for agricultural labor within German territory attracts attention because of its size. But the draining of the working population to release Germans for the army has been going on for some time.

The Sons of Canada.

The Sons of Canada, and who are they?
The Challenged to a deadly fray,
With heart of steel, to dare, to do,
To play the game, in God's way, through,
Their gallant best;—in soul array,
And these are they!

The Sons of Canada, and who are they?
The men who feel the forward sway,
Till blood-red hand of Iron Will
Has spent its frightfulness, its ill;
So note them; hark them; they obey—
Well, these are they!

The Sons of Canada, and who are they!
No pretence at a vain display,—
The men who make the battle strong,
For right, for honor,—with a song!
The men who smile on hope's dim day,
And these are they!

The Sons of Canada, and who are they?
They struggle for a later day,
When world of pain and strife forgot,
The stars still shine,—forget them not!
And mark their splendor while you may!
For these are they!

The Sons of Canada, and who are they?
The marshalled hosts on Death's highway,
Who grapple with the hour's despair,
And smite the evil lurking there,
Then pass, with glory, from the day,
And these are they!

ALICE IRENE WOOD.

ENGLISH AND GERMAN HATE

A Member of the British Expeditionary Force in France Tells His Story.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial in this morning's issue on the German and English hate question is quite the best and truest that has come to my notice and clearly states what I have found difficult to explain since my return to the States after serving with the British expeditionary force in France.

One of my clearest recollections is the faces of my comrades the morning the reports of the Edith Cavell execution came out. Naturally I expected an outburst of hate and threats of vengeance, but nothing like this was evidenced. The men sat with stern, fixed expressions, compressed lips and clenched hands, showing how they felt. This was the same spirit I saw in France. Fortunately or unfortunately, my stay with my battalion was short, as I was hurt and sent home.

But I never can forget one surprise visit we paid to the German trenches near the Bassée Canal. The work done was fearful in its determined ferocity, and I have no hesitancy in saying that the Lusitania and Cavell affairs were back of it all. Getting back into our own trenches, I had thought the men would have been "talking it over," seeing it was our first fight. But no reference was made. It was more or less weird to me, nor am I sure that I understood it all; but this I believe, that the spirit of my chums is the spirit of the English army, and glad I am they are not after me.

We were shelled on the way up to the trenches and lost a lot of good men, but there was not the slightest sign of confusion. Men uninjured did all they could for the wounded, in spite of the fact that we were in the open, with shells falling thick and fast. I for one am grateful for quiet, manly sympathy on that occasion.

The whole war is beyond the power of speech, and while the Statue of Liberty looked good to me there are many moments that I would like to be back serving with those ... who will never rest until the many acts of wanton cruelty are paid and settled for. And that same quiet spirit of determination of which you write and which I saw will see them successful to that end.

A FUSILIER.

New York, Aug. 8, 1916.

Prolonging the War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will you permit me through your influential journal to point out to the admirers of Mr. Wilson a fact that seems to have escaped their apprehension?

They know that America was one of the signatories to the solemn pledge guaranteeing the inviolability of Belgium; they know that when Germany violated that pledge Mr. Wilson alone, America's representative, ignored her share in it, maintaining absolute silence; they know that "Silence gives consent" and that by this silence he therefore gave tacit approval to Germany's crime; they know that after clear proof of Germany's atrocities, not only in Belgium and France but even in America itself, he sent his congratulations and those of the American people to the Kaiser on his birthday; they know that after clear proof that German agents were not only plotting in this alleged neutral country against the Allies but were also engaged in schemes of hostility against America, schemes leading to the destruction of American docks, American factories, millions of dollars' worth of other American property and, finally, the lives of American men, women and children, he continued to protect and harbor these enemies of his country. These are historical facts that none of these admirers can deny; but perhaps they do not realize that by such conduct, instead of mitigating its horrors, instead of assisting to shorten it, he increased the horrors and has been immeasurably instrumental in prolonging this awful war.

HAUT CONWAY.

Montclair, N. J., Aug. 8, 1916.

A Dangerous Political Body.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your Cornwall correspondent in the issue of August 7, who dubs me an arrogant boaster, but does me the honor of desiring to meet me, acknowledges the point I desired to make in calling for a list of the convictions of German-American citizens for crimes against the neutrality of the United States.

This constant vilification of the German-Americans is having a tendency to draw them together for mutual protection and is changing men who were the most independent voters in the country into a dangerous political body, which will hold the balance of power in this country and be able to dictate its policies.

If your correspondent thinks this will inure to the benefit of the country, I must disagree with him.

He shows that bias which is characteristic of Englishmen resident in America and his contempt for the "unpronounceable decisions raked from the musty tomes we know as law" by upholding the British blacklist, despite the declaration of the Secretary of State that it is an unwonted interference with the rights of our citizens.

His statement that "the viewpoint of a nation that is bleeding is not the viewpoint of a country overrun with money changers" is a slap at the very people who are aiding the Entente nations to the best of their ability.

HARRY MASTERS BUCKLIN.
(A "stanch Kaiserist.")

New York, Aug. 8, 1916.

"We-All" and "You-All."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Since you have dignified a bit of negro dialect with an editorial in your issue of August 8, permit me to give you the facts and custom of negroes living in the Gulf States.

They invariably use "you-all" (pronounced "yawl") when speaking in the second person plural, and frequently say "we-all" when speaking in the first person plural, but these expressions are never used when talking in the singular number. I was raised in Alabama on a large cotton plantation and make frequent visits to my native environs, mixing with the primitive negroes, learning anew their quaint and interesting dialect.

The dialect of the Gulf States negroes and that of the Atlantic coast are so different that I have heard negro laborers brought from the South Atlantic coast to the interior of Alabama utterly fail to make themselves understood when talking to those raised in Alabama. Therefore, the customs and sayings of one section do not apply to all.

A LOVER OF NEGRO DIALECT.

New York, Aug. 8, 1916.

Travel in England.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Referring to a letter in your columns signed "O. K." and dated August 1, in which the writer complained about conditions which govern travel in England, I wish to say that the annoyances to which he referred are most unusual.

I returned from England five weeks ago, and beyond the usual registration—such as was in force in Germany before the war—upon landing at Liverpool I was not asked to report myself again and moved about the country at my pleasure.

There are absolutely no restrictions in England in force against foreign visitors, unless their activities abroad have aroused the suspicions of British secret service men.

New York, Aug. 7, 1916. M. D.

"IT BEGINS!"

BLUNDERS OF KULTUR

Propagandists Who Fail to Agree Among Themselves.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The able editorial on German and English hate in to-day's issue of The Tribune alludes to Professor Münsterberg's prediction that the war must end in a draw and an Anglo-German-American alliance. Professor Horrwitz, in a thoughtful article which recently appeared in "The Evening Post," arrives at similar conclusions. On the other hand, Dr. von Mach, of babies' milk fame, and the notoriety seeking editor of "The Fatherland" have uttered different views. Dr. Albert and Professor Shepherd have avoided expression on the subject.

I simply recall these facts, which have little interest in themselves, because the German propaganda is always praised to the sky for its clocklike precision and efficient organization. Yet the exponents of Teutonic Kultur in America, since the overbubbling days of Dr. Dernburg to the reticent era of his present successors, have fought the German press campaign independently and ineffectually. They neither understood nor ever touched the soul of English-speaking America, which ignores or ridicules the unfortunate propagandists on whom their ill-advised government spends so much money—a needless extravagance, it seems, in these hard times through which the Fatherland is passing.

ARTHUR S. SHIELDS.

New York, Aug. 8, 1916.

Backboneless Americans.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Kindly allow the sentiment of the majority of the workers a fair answer to Mr. William Temple, who expressed in your paper his confused ideas concerning the situation of the striking street railway men in Greater New York.

Mr. Temple divides the people here into tribes, "Americans" and "aliens." The American Constitution knows only one nation, "Americans." The Indians considered all white men as "aliens," intruders; they were to drive all the aliens "into the ocean."

But "square jawed" aliens, like Washington, Franklin, Paul Jones, Hancock and Paine, had the nerve to call the people together and protest against tyranny, and finally threw off the English yoke of oppression, in spite of some that were satisfied with the conditions.

And in spite of slave barons and animal-like slaves, contented to stay in slavery, such aliens as Lincoln set the slaves free, and he was shot, the reward for his honest policy, paired with wisdom and common sense.

To tell the truth in a nutshell, all the workers want to unite—very few exceptions found. All the bosses will do their best to prevent organization. A few union organizers turn dishonest, tempted by alluring offerings from the other side. Sam Parks turned out a bribe taker, but he built one of the strongest unions existing. He was a rare example of a grafter among the workers, only following the example so common among those "higher up."

Mr. Temple, you are right when you say the Americans lack backbone. They bow in humble submission under the lash, and when "aliens" come and tell them to be men they are afraid, sign the bosses' request that everything is O. K., and then run and tell: "We had to sign or lose our jobs." And then they are styled "loyal workers." What a farce, what a lie! What fools they are, on both sides.

Why not organize an orderly factor on each side and have plain understanding and agreements, like other trades? For instance, the bricklayers have never had a strike since 1882, when a compact was formed by both sides. Why not so with the railway men and all trades? Be sensible, and not hotheads and fools!

F. G. W.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Aug. 7, 1916.

The General Manager's Luncheon.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: General Manager Maher, of the Third Avenue lines, has fixed 15 cents as sufficient for a policeman's lunch. Another official of the company fixed 30 cents, but General Manager Maher had the final say. Checks for 15 cents will, therefore, be issued by him to the policemen assigned to protect his office and his lines. Of course, the policemen—especially the stouter ones—do not like this. It made a good story.

And there is significance in it. The policeman does a hard, physical, immensely necessary work. He will pace up and down all day long, protecting, perhaps fighting for, General Manager Maher. This individual will sit in his office, not so hard a lot physically. But I venture to believe his luncheon check will aggregate more than 15 cents—at least he is apt to tip the waiter a quarter, thus bringing it to 40 cents.

The policy he expresses in this trifling incident is a policy well known to the men who are striking; it is the cause of the strike.

R.

Cornwall, N. Y., Aug. 5, 1916.

Floundering Into War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Because of published speculations about the probable policies of Mr. Hughes, had he been occupying the Presidential chair during the last three years, compared with the performances of the present Administration, it may in the first place be permissible to point out that certain complications resulting from the war in matters concerning this country have been caused by Mr. Wilson's ill-advised policies. If a firm and capable pilot had been guiding our ship of state during the last three years conditions would have been entirely different. The knowledge that power was behind the words and that no violations of international laws would be tolerated would surely have had a healthy influence on the warring nations and prevented many insolent actions.

In regard to Mexico, we all must admit that Mr. Wilson, because of his floundering policies, is largely to blame for the awful conditions that are now existing in that sorely afflicted country. What Mr. Hughes would have done, if President, would surely have been to take proper steps, in the beginning of the trouble, for Mexico's early restoration to peace and order. He might have recognized Huerta and helped in the destruction of the bandits, and thereafter caused an election of President to be held under the guidance of the combined American nations. Whereafter Mexico, with the friendly aid of the said nations, would have been in a favorable way of rejuvenation and might at this time be celebrating the arrival of a new and prosperous era. To put an end to a conflagration by "watchful waiting" doesn't seem to bring favorable results.

While thinking about Mexico, the sorry state of unpreparedness that was exposed when the militia was called out for service lately naturally comes to mind, and it may be proper to ask whether it is not possible that preparations for the safety of the country have suffered somewhat on account of tender nursings of the "pork barrel."

The present illusory prosperity of the country, caused by abnormal demand for supplies in order to prosecute a terrible war, may well be designated as a "fool's paradise," because it is only a bubble that will burst, with alarming detonation, when reaction sets in after peace is declared. In this connection and in view of the present food prices it may be pertinent to ask whether the promised reduction of the cost of living has materialized to any great extent as the result of present free trade policies in force.

The safeguarding of American industry in all its branches from the dangers of ruinous competition after the war by protective tariff legislation is a paramount issue of this campaign, and as Mr. Hughes is an outspoken friend of a protective tariff it seems that this is one of the reasons why he should be the logical successor to the free trading champion of the present administration.

FRITZ NORRBY.

Morristown, N. J., Aug. 7, 1916.

Good Music for All.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Please accept the thanks of the Civic Orchestral Society for the encouraging and inspiring editorial in this morning's issue of The Tribune. Such words as these are indeed a stimulus toward further endeavor, and it is more than cheering to feel that your great newspaper is with us in the effort to give the public good music, well performed, at prices all can afford.

For the great success which has attended the concerts thus far we feel that no small share of the credit is due The Tribune. In this undertaking the principal citizens, the press and the music-loving public of New York are setting an example to the rest of the country—an example that will be fruitful beyond all expectations.

MARTHA MAYNARD,
Secretary, Civic Orchestral Society.

New York, Aug. 4, 1916.

THE BOSSED UNIONS

A Plea for Self-Government in Labor Organizations.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Unions stand for the protection and the rights of the workingman. The men in joining the union have prospects of a more equal fight against capital. Unions really advocate the ruling of majority over money. But is it so? Do the men have their say, their right, and their protection? If unions were projected with the idea of giving men a chance to dispute questions of their welfare with their employers on an equal basis, then the present state of unionism is a degeneration of its previous condition. Unions are under the control of paid "bosses." The men give up so much of their salary to these leaders for their supposed aid and direction. The men themselves have little or nothing to say in matters concerning them. Strikes can be called, on or off, without their assent. The affair the other night at the Lyceum was a blind over the public's eyes. If the leaders had determined upon the question of striking or not the vote of the men would not have influenced their decision.

I noticed in a semi-weekly local periodical a cartoon which depicted the situation exactly. It showed the "boss" in an automobile crossing the car tracks at the side of which a group of citizens are standing seemingly waiting for the car that will not come. In a vulgar way he turns and sneers, "Youse can walk." He rides. And the poor striker, afraid to become a strikebreaker, is affected by the strike. His family is starving. The "boss" rolls in wealth, wealth acquired from the sweat of the men's brows. Then again, the unions are not favored by public opinion. The forced striker becomes a person to be looked upon with disfavor. Why? Because he has left his post and made demands that seem impossible to fulfil? No! Because the "boss" whimsically and for personal reasons so ordains that it should be a strike. It is not the poor employe who is the cause of the deplorable conditions, but the leader!

Unionism will never become a national institution until the union is self-governed—"of the men, by the men, and for the men."

Unionism is still in the days of its making. It can be moulded and remoulded into a thousand different shapes. Therefore, when it discovers its mistake, it will oust the "boss" from its folds. Then will it become an institution recognized and lauded by one and all. Then will the men benefit from its protection. Then will strikes be less in number and more successful in their conclusion. Till then, the labor question is in as great a plight as ever. We are progressing in science and the arts. We are degenerating in all else!

MORTIMER J. ADLER.

New York, Aug. 6, 1916.

From Bad to Worse at the Border.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Inclosed is an extract from a letter written by a New York boy doing duty on the border. Seems to me there is a place for things like this in your valuable columns.

J. R. SMITH.

New York, Aug. 7, 1916.

(Extract from a letter written on August 3, 1916, at McAllen, Tex.)

As to the eats, things have been going from bad to worse. Yesterday morning two companies went on strike and refused to eat. The breakfast consisted of a large tablespoonful of oatmeal which was wormy, two pieces of hardtack and a cup of liquid they call coffee. This noon, after a hard three and one-half hours' drill, we got a similar amount of rice (burnt) and a cup of tea and one piece of bread, and as a consequence three companies went on strike.

The men are greatly dissatisfied, and I guess you can't blame them much. It is not so much the fault of our immediate superiors as the graft higher up. We feel some one is getting rich through this experimental campaign of the militia, and we are all anxious to get back. So you see, in spite of the flowery reports some of the papers have, we are not so comfortable.

We are still sleeping on the ground and still without a shower or a place to bathe, and yet we are supposed to keep clean.

I am not writing this as a kick on my part, but just to let you know what conditions exist, and you are at liberty to use this in any way you wish.

A NEW YORK BOY AT THE BORDER.